

then extend the termination date to 1992. The amendment we are offering, which is what you would be voting on next, changes that date from 1992 back to 1988. Now I understand Senator Wesely wants to make it '89 which is fine by me. The point I am making is the essence of this bill, the sole thing the bill does is continue the program that has been in effect and has I think according to studies done by opponents and proponents had the highest return on investment of anything this state has ever invested in. It has really been one of those things that you look back and you say it has been an incredible success, and with that said, I would urge you to adopt the amendment or listen to Senator Wesely's motion to change it one more year.

PRESIDENT: The amendment to the amendment is on the desk.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Wesely would move to amend the committee amendments. (Wesely amendment appears on page 446 of the Legislative Journal.)

PRESIDENT: Senator Wesely.

SENATOR WESELY: Thank you, Mr. President. As Senator DeCamp said, we are trying to just work out exactly how long the program should go before we review it next. It is estimated that there is about \$33 million left in school weatherization projects that need to be done out there across the State of Nebraska. We have done about \$13 million worth of projects so far. The return on that investment has been over 16 percent. The savings we have resulted from in the saving energy, saving tax dollars has been an incredible investment return as Senator DeCamp talked about. So it has been a big success. We have got about \$13 million done, 33 million more to go and we going about \$5 million a year is how much we can get done. So we really need about six more years and we are talking now after the sunset date here, six more years of that \$5 million a year to make the \$30 million we need to cover the projects left out there. So really that is why the 1992 figure was first proposed. I think as Senator DeCamp said, the committee cut it back to 1988. I don't know why they did that exactly but I would suggest rather than only a two year extension, it has proven itself, the program that has been there, let's go with three years, split the six year difference in what we can identify as projects left and then a couple of years from now again look at the program and see